UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,743	01/10/2002	Scott James Weaver	9288 (3225-130)	3989

26884   7590   01/04/2007

PAUL W. MARTIN
NCR CORPORATION, LAW DEPT.
1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD.
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER
VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/041,743	WEAVER, SCOTT JAMES
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 November 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _17-33_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _17-33_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 11/02/06.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1, 25, 32 have been amended. Claims 1-33

are pending in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 17-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tamboli et al.,

USPN: 6,792,431 (hereinafter Tamboli).

As per claim 17, Tamboli discloses a method of translating data from a data format of a

first software component to a format of a data model of a second software component, the

method comprising the steps of:

creating a first schema comprising the model of the first software component (e.g. Fig 1:

adapter *102*, Transform *206*, mappings *120* – Note: *dynamic common format* and *mappings*

generated by XSL via adapter service on XML metadata reads on schema model– see col. 10,

lines 35-58; Fig. 4 – of the first software component -- see First Native *106* – Fig 1); integrating

the first schema into a data wedge (e.g. Dynamic Common Model 118– Fig 2);

creating a second schema comprising the model of the second software component (e.g.

e.g. Fig. 1: adapter *124*, Transform *206*, mappings *120* – Note: mappings and adapter

transformation for the second native format reads on XML schema model for second software component); integrating the second schema into a data wedge (e.g. Dynamic Common Model 118 – Fig 2; col. 7, lines 36-47);

populating a data model of the first software component (e.g. Fig. 4 – Note: mappings for a XML schema reads on populating a model with its mappings – see *common format subsets of a dynamic common model 119-* col. 20, lines 12-22; Fig. 17 – Note: subsets of a common model are also model);

translating a data element in the data model from a first format of the first software component schema to a second format of the second software component (e.g. Fig. 2, Fig. 10, 10A, 10B) using the data wedge (e.g. col. 7, line 36 to col. 8, line 13); and

transferring the translated data element to the second software component when a function of the second software component is called by the first software component (e.g. *datatypes 110, native format 112, 128* - Fig. 2; catalog adapter 102, 124, Fig. 1 – Note: user interface for enabling functions attributes for a first native format to be specified – see Fig. 18-19; col. 12, lines 29-42 – in order for a transaction be effected in a second format via adapter services reads on function being implemented in second component --2nd native format—after **receiving** parameters/specifications being **translated from** adapter service, the translation into the second format based on such specifications as a result of a request in first component - 1st native format – in light of function calls -- see *callable segments, parameters, return data* – col. 7, lines 11-25 -- to retrieve objects in a catalog-based transaction – see col. 13, lines 1-25; Fig. 5).

As per claim 18, Tamboli discloses triggering an event to notify the second software component of translated data element availability (spider - col. 22, lines 37-51; Fig. 11C, Fig. 19 - Note: event information passing by *spider* to update (or synchronizing) catalog with available transformed methods from data integration application reads on event notification by a process).

As per claim 19, Tamboli discloses reading translated data by the second software component (Note: data being converted for use as method/program native to and for another application reads on data being read by such applications via transformation service (*adapters*) and updating services (*spiders*) – see col. 4, line 5-31).

As per claim 20, Tamboli discloses removing and updating elements from a model (e.g. col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 20, line 55 to col. 21, line 22 – Note: manually updating of catalog model by user reads on removing and updating)

As per claim 21, Tamboli discloses creating an instance of a data wedge (e.g. Data Integration Application 116, Fig. 1-2– Note: a runtime conversion graphical framework retrieving specific native file by a user reads on instance of a data wedge).

As per claim 22, Tamboli discloses subsets of a common format model of a data wedge (col. 7, lines 32-50; *dynamic common formats 119 ... dynamic common format 118* – col. 20, line 11-22), hence has disclosed both first and second software schema including name of common data wedge.

As per claim 23, Tamboli discloses setting default value and default data elements for the data model of the first software component (Fig. 4; col. 19, line 61-67; col. 20, lines 11-17 – Note: XSL using data from native form and mappings to create XSL file reads on populating fields on XSL with mappings, i.e. XSL default template/tags are being populated – see Fig. 8)

As per claim 24, user manually changing attributes of model reads on modifying data element of a data model of first component (re claim 20)

As per claim 25, Tamboli discloses a computer system for translating data from a data format of a first software component to a format of a data model of a second software component, the system comprising a processor; a memory coupled to said processor; the memory having stored therein data and sequences of instructions which, when executed by said processor, cause said processor to integrate software components by causing the processor to:

create a first schema of the first software component,

integrate the schema into a data wedge,

create a second schema of the second software component, integrate the second schema into a data wedge;

populate a data model of the first software component, and

translate data elements in the data model from a first format of a first software component schema to a second format of a second software component;

all of these steps having been addressed in the corresponding rejection thereof in claim 1;

and transferring the translated data element to the second software component when a function of the second software component is called by the first software component (e.g. *datatypes 110, native format 112, 128* - Fig. 2; catalog adapter 102, 124, Fig. 1 – Note: user interface for enabling functions attributes for a first native format to be specified – see Fig. 18-19; col. 12, lines 29-42 – in order for a transaction be effected in a second format via adapter services reads on function being implemented in second component --2nd native format—after **receiving** parameters/specifications **being translated from** adapter service, the translation into

the second format based on such specifications as a result of a request in first component - 1st

native format – in light of function calls -- see *callable segments, parameters, return data* – col.

7, lines 11-25 -- to retrieve objects in a catalog-based transaction – see col. 13, lines 1-25; Fig.

5).

As per claims 26-31, these claims correspond to claims 18, 20, 21, 24, 22 and 23

respectively; and are rejected with the corresponding rejections as set forth therein.

As per claim 32, Tamboli discloses a computer system for translating data from a data

format of a first software component to a format of a data model of a second software

component, the system comprising a processor; a memory coupled to said processor, wherein

said processor is configured to execute a sequence of instructions contained in said memory, the

instructions comprising:

a data wedge (e.g. Dynamic Common Model 118– Fig 2) including a first schema of the

first software component (e.g. Fig 1: adapter *102*, Transform *206*, mappings *120*; col. 10, lines

35-58; Fig. 4 – Note: transformation using mappings from XML metadata from a first native

form reads on the first software component -- see First Native *106* – Fig 1) and

a second schema of the second software component (e.g. Fig. 1: adapter *124*, Transform

206, mappings *120* – Note: mappings and adapter transformation for the second native format

reads on XML schema model for second software component being integrated into the modeling

application); integrating the first schema into a data wedge (e.g. Dynamic Common Model 118 –

Fig 2; col. 7, lines 36-47.);

the data wedge configured to translate a data element from the first data view in

accordance with the first schema to the second data view in accordance with the second schema

(Fig. 2, Fig. 10, 10A, 10B; col. 7, line 36 to col. 8, line 13); and

to transfer the translated data element to the second software component when a function

of the second software component is called by the first software component (e.g. *datatypes 110,*

native format 112, 128 - Fig. 2; *catalog adapter 102, 124*-Fig. 1 – Note: user interface for

enabling functions attributes for a first native format to be specified – see Fig. 18-19; col. 12,

lines 29-42 – in order for a transaction be effected in a second format via adapter services reads

function being implemented in second component --2nd native format—after **receiving**

parameters/specifications **being translated from** adapter service, the translation into the second

format based on such specifications as a result of a request in first component - 1st native format

– in light of function calls -- see *callable segments, parameters, return data* – col. 7, lines 11-25

-- to retrieve objects in a catalog-based transaction – see col. 13, lines 1-25; Fig. 5).

As per claim 33, Tamboli discloses data model in a integration application (e.g. Fig. 1)

configured to trigger an event to notify the second software component of translated data element

availability (spider - col. 22, lines 37-51; Fig. 11C, Fig. 19 - Note: event information passing by

spider to update (or synchronizing) catalog with available transformed methods – from one

native form to another – effectuated from within the data integration application reads on event

notification by a process).

4.   Claims 17, 25, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Worden et al., USPubN: 2003/0149934 (hereinafter Worden)

As per claim 17, Worden discloses a method of translating data from a data format of a

first software component to a format of a data model of a second software component, the

method comprising the steps of:

creating a first schema comprising the model of the first software component (e.g. Fig.

10: XML (1), Schema (1); para 0014-0119);

creating a second schema comprising the model of the second software component;

integrating the first schema into a data wedge (e.g. Fig. 10: XML (2), Schema(2) – Note:

business information model and graphical interface reads on data wedge—see para 0037-0042);

populating a data model of the first software component (e.g. Fig. 32-59);

translating a data element in the data model from a first format of the first software

component schema to a second format of the second software component (e.g. para 0844-0854;

Fig. 57-58; para 0279-0285).

As per claim 25, see claim 17.

As per claim 32, Worden discloses a computer system for translating data from a data

format of a first software component to a format of a data model of a second software

component, the system comprising a processor; a memory coupled to said processor, wherein

said processor is configured to execute a sequence of instructions contained in said memory, the

instructions comprising:

a data wedge (e.g. Note: business information model and graphical interface reads on

data wedge—see para 0037-0042) including a first schema of the first software component (e.g.

Fig. 10: XML (1), Schema (1); para 0014-0119) and

a second schema of the second software component (e.g. Fig. 10: XML (2), Schema(2));

the data wedge configured to translate a data element from the first data view in

accordance with the first schema to the second data view in accordance with the second schema

(e.g. para 0844-0854; Fig. 57-58; para 0279-0285).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/02/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observations in regard thereto.

Applicants have submitted that the added limitation would be a requirement that is

deemed to be missing in Tamboli (see Appl. Rmrks, pg. 6). The rejection as set forth above has

pointed out how the newly added feature has been met. By providing a tool to enable

specification of attributes necessary for a function of a transaction request in a given native form

be effected via adapter services, the catalog-based transaction paradigm by Tamboli can be

consummated by providing needed parameters to adapt 2 separate native functions one into the

other using adapter services; that is, a first format of a request can be effected in a second format

via adapter translation, so that the parameter specifications associated with the first native format

request or call -- can be transferred by means of interfacing with the adapter service, so that the

specifications can support translation to the native form in the second format.

The Applicants' arguments are thus not convincing.

Therefore, the claims will stand rejected as set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before

using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-

272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2193
December 27, 2006